

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 17, 2006. Claims 1 to 35 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 16 and 33 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288 (Reed), and Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Reed in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,288 (Logan). In this regard, Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the restriction of Claims 33 to 35. However, Applicants wish to point out that no art rejection of Claim 35 has been entered, although no indication of allowability for Claim 35 has been entered either. Therefore, Applicants can only presume that Claim 35 is allowable, but respectfully request confirmation of the status of Claim 35. Nonetheless, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to the art rejections of Claims 1 to 34, although only minor amendments were made to the claims in the previous amendment, the Office Action has more or less broadened the alleged teachings of the prior art by withdrawing the disclosure of Huboi and relying solely on the disclosure of Reed as allegedly rendering the invention obvious. However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

One seminal feature of the invention lies in the configuration of an interface between a content provider application and a content providing application in broadband printing systems. According to the invention, there are three distinct levels of configuration that can be performed on the content providing application: a broadband content service provider level (BPPS level), a multi-service operator level (MSO level),

and an end user level. The BPPS level is considered the top level and a BPPS provider (e.g., a company such as Canon, Inc. which may operate such a BPPS service) is provided with administrative properties on a top level to configure the interface between the content service provider application and the content providing application. One of those administrative properties is the ability to add or delete content service providers (e.g., advertisers, trade journals, news providers, etc.) that provide content that ultimately can be selected by end user subscribers. The second (or mid-level) is the MSO level. By way of example, an MSO may be a cable company or a communications company for a local area that provides a multiplicity of communications services (e.g., internet services, cable television services, telephone services, etc.). Each MSO that wants to be able to have its customers (the end users) subscribe to the broadband content printing service configures the content providing application on a second level. The second level includes the administration properties of the first level, with the exception of the ability to add or delete content service providers. That is, each MSO is provided with the ability to configure the content providing application for their end users by, for example, configuring which content provided by the content providers configured at the top level they want to allow their end users to be able to subscribe to, but the MSOs cannot add or delete the content providers themselves. The third level is the end user level, and when an end user wants to subscribe to the broadband content printing service, they configure the content providing application on the end user (third) level, which comprises selecting which content (filtered out by their respective MSO) they want to receive with their subscription. Thus, the three-tiered system and the distinct administrative properties of each tier for configuring the

content providing application form the substance of the claimed invention, and such a system is simply not taught by the cited art.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 is a publication service interface between a content service provider application and a content providing application in a network printing system, comprising functionality for configuring the interface for the content service provider to interface with the content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties, wherein the content service provider administration properties comprise a service configuration operation, which includes at least one of an operation of adding a content service provider and an operation of deleting a content service provider, for a parameter to provide a service provided by the content service provider, functionality for configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level, wherein the second level comprises multi-service level administration properties that comprise a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the service configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the content service provider application, and functionality for configuring the interface for an end user to interface with the content providing application on a third level, wherein the third level comprises end user level administration properties that comprise a portion of the multi-service provider administration properties.

Amended independent Claims 10 and 14 are method claims, while amended independent Claims 15 and 16 are system claims, each of which substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of configuring an interface for a content service provider application to interface with a content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties including a service configuration operation, which includes at least one of an operation of adding a content service provider and an operation of deleting a content service provider, for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider, and configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level comprising a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the service configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the service provider application.

Reed merely discloses that a provider computer and a consumer computer communicate directly with one another so that changes on the provider computer result in an updated version being transferred to the consumer computer. However, Reed fails to disclose or to suggest the three-tiered configuration system of the claimed invention, or the three levels of administration properties for configuring the content service providing application as claimed. In this regard, the Office Action alleges that Reed discloses “functionality for configuring the interface for the service provider (provider program 12 of Fig. 1) to interface with the content providing application (consumer program 22 of Fig. 1) on a first level, wherein the first level comprises service provider administration properties, wherein the content service administration properties comprise an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the content service provider

(administrator, col. 26, lines 23-31)". Thus, Reed merely discloses controlling information transferred between a provider computer and a consumer computer in which the provider control which content is made available to consumers, and consumers control which content they want to receive. This is merely a two-tiered system and is not a three-tiered system as claimed in the present invention. Therefore, the present invention would not, and indeed could not, have been obvious over Reed.

Applicants also wish to point out that it appears from the Office Action that the Examiner may not have considered Applicants' previous arguments in their entirety. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the Applicant argues, in essence, that "Reed et al. do not teach an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider." However, Applicants patentability arguments stated that "[t]he applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of configuring an interface for a content service provider application to interface with a content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties including an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider, and configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level comprising a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the initial configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the service provider application." Thus, the Office Action's "in essence" statement makes it evident that the full extent of

Applicants' patentability arguments have not been considered, which is simply improper. (See MPEP 707.07(f) which requires the Examiner to answer all material traversed.)

Logan has been studied but is not seen to add anything that, when combined with Reed, would have resulted in the features of the invention. Specifically, a combination of Reed and Logan is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of configuring an interface for a content service provider application to interface with a content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties including a service configuration operation, which includes at least one of an operation of adding a content service provider and an operation of deleting a content service provider, for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider, and configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level comprising a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the service configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the service provider application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, as well as the deficiencies of the applied art, all of Claims 1 to 35 are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/
Attorney for Applicants
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 118209v1